

## PDF hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen

The following full text is a publisher's version.

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<http://hdl.handle.net/2066/67835>

Please be advised that this information was generated on 2017-12-06 and may be subject to change.

## STATUES ON THE WALL: THE REPRESENTATION OF STATUARY IN ROMAN WALL PAINTING

Eric M. MOORMANN

Vermutlich mindestens ebenso wichtig sind jedoch die Möglichkeiten der Malerei, mit Realitätsebenen zu spielen: die gemalte Statue erscheint lebendig, die gemalte Person statuarisch, ob es sich um eine Statue oder eine lebendige Figur handelt, bleibt offen.

Probably, the possibilities that painting has to play with the levels of realism are important as well: the painted statue looks alive, the painted person statuesque, whether it is a statue or a living figure remains uncertain.<sup>1</sup>

### INTRODUCTION

Roman wall paintings frequently show images of works of art, precious objects, and statues. Some of them may be copies after famous examples of previous periods, most of which we know only from written sources, but the greater part of these frescos originated from the painters' own fantasy. One might ask whether the painter had the same concept of a statue when making his murals as the consumer had when ordering a real or a painted statue for his house. Like a writer in his *ekphrasis* (description, often used as a rhetorical depiction of art work), a painter had great freedom in rendering his sculpture, as he was free from the obstacles faced regularly by sculptors, such as stability, dimension, and materiality.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Agnes Allroggen-Bedel, "Hellenistische Gruppen in der römisch-kampanischen Wandmalerei," in *Hellenistische Gruppen: Gedenkschrift für Andreas Linfert* (Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 1999), 357–63, esp. 359.

<sup>2</sup> In general, the "realism" of Roman painting must not be taken too literally. See Rolf A. Tybout, *Aedificiorum figurae: Untersuchungen zu den Architekturdarstellungen*

To date, my research has focused on statues represented in Roman wall paintings, which could serve as sources for our understanding of classical sculpture. The work has been based on the notion that Roman wall painting had a highly imitative character. This means that, from the earliest traces in the so-called First Style wall painting onwards,<sup>3</sup> decorators suggested the presence of real objects on the walls. These were precious marble blocks or wall revetments, jewel boxes, incense burners, glasses full of fruit, or living men and animals. All sorts of material items that surrounded people in daily life could be inserted into structural, wall-composing, and wall-dividing schemes. The criteria for recognizing figures in wall paintings as sculpture are as follows:<sup>4</sup>

- 1) figures that are set and function within architectural structures, like *acroteria* (statues or ornaments placed at the apex and the ends of pediments) and caryatids (draped female figures substituted for columns) (fig. 1);
- 2) figures that are mounted on pedestals and consoles (fig. 2);
- 3) shapes that are statuesque *sui generis*, e.g., herms (fig. 4);
- 4) figures that are obviously or probably reproductions from well-known types (figs. 3, 5);

*des frühen zweiten Stils* (Amsterdam: Gieben, 1989), 25–41. Regarding certain categories of objects imitated on walls, see Michael J. Klein, ed., *Römische Glaskunst und Wandmalerei* (Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 1999); Anna Elisabeth Riz, *Bronzegefäße in der römisch-pompejanischen Wandmalerei* (Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 1990); John Tamm, "Argentum pottorium in Romano-Campanian Wall-Painting" (Ph.D. diss., McManto University, 2003); idem, "Argentum Pottorium and the Campanian Wall-Painter: The Priscus Service Revisited," *Bulletin Antieke Beschaving* 80 (2005): 73–90.

<sup>3</sup> Based on the findings in Pompeii, modern scholars, beginning with August Mau in 1882, divide the typology of Roman wall paintings into four "styles"; see August Mau, *Geschichte der decorativen Wandmalerei in Pompeji* (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1882); more recently, see Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, *Houses and Society in Pompeii and Herculaneum* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994); for a helpful pictorial survey, see Ernesto de Carolis, "Houses and Society," in *Pompeii: The History, Life and Art of the Buried City* (ed. Marisa R. Panetta; Vercelli: White Star, 2004), 250–7.

<sup>4</sup> Eric M. Moormann, *La pittura parietale romana come fonte di conoscenza per la scultura antica* (Assen/Wolfeboro: Van Gorcum, 1988), 9–10; Allroggen-Bedel, "Hellenistische Gruppen," 358.

- 5) figures' color, polychromy, whiteness, and imitation of material (fig. 1);
- 6) statues that are inserted into figurative scenes (mythological scenes, landscapes, gardens) (figs. 4, 5).

Some examples may illustrate these categories. In particular, the architectonically composed façades of the early and middle first century B.C.E. and those of the second half of the first century C.E. show statues. A striking case is that of a façade in the lunette of a wall in the Sarno Baths at Pompeii, painted in the third quarter of the first century C.E. (fig. 1). Here two white figures occupy large vertical bands flanking a panel with a seated, statuesque deity. They stand on top of the cornice of a panel with sea creatures below and support small blocks under the circular frame of the lunette. Statues on pedestals are present in several contexts, especially in a sort of gallery in front of smooth panels, as in the small room 4 of the Villa of the Mysteries, dated to the years 70–60 B.C.E. (fig. 2). Figures standing on consoles are frequently featured as vignettes on panel decorations in the first century C.E. The repertoire is limited to Erotes, Muses (here fig. 2 and those in the House of Syricus at Pompeii)<sup>5</sup> and nude warriors.<sup>6</sup> As early as the sixth century B.C.E., Greek architects used human figures as supports in their buildings. Painters had even fewer problems inserting caryatids and telamons (a figure of a man used as a supporting pillar or pilaster) into their painted

<sup>5</sup> Moormann, *La pittura*, 29, 54–55; Carsten Schneider, *Die Musengruppe von Milet* (Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 1999), 227–30; Eric M. Moormann, "Le Muse a casa," in *I temi figurativi nella pittura parietale antica (IV sec. a.C. – IV sec. d.C.): Atti del VI convegno internazionale sulla pittura parietale antica* (ed. Daniela Scagliarini Corlàita; Imola: University Press Bologna, 1997), 97–102.

<sup>6</sup> As to the category of nude warriors, Volker Michael Strocka recently proposed that these figures be seen as reflections of the emperor Nero's rather classicizing taste; according to Strocka, they should evoke the acquisition and production of numerous statues that echo the famous Doryphorus, or Spear-Bearer, made by the fifth-century B.C.E. sculptor Polyclitus, and similar sculptural types produced during his era; see Volker Michael Strocka, "Neros Statuenraub für die Domus Aurea: Zeitgenössische Reflexe," in *Neroniana VI: Rome à l'époque néronienne* (ed. Jean-Michel Croisille and Yves Perrin; Bruxelles: Latomus, 2002), 35–45, pls. 4–10. However, it is not easy to argue for a special interest in this specific sculptural type of the Doryphorus only in this period, and it is also not clear that these murals date to the era of Nero (which Strocka notes).

constructions. A clear example is the portico composed of herms with their upper parts shaped as human bodies and with the heads of Dionysiac creatures in the House of the Cryptoporticus at Pompeii, adorned in this way in the middle of the first century B.C.E. These figures support an *epistylum*, i.e., the lintel-like feature that forms the roof of a colonnade. Behind the figures garlands are suspended.

Furthermore, famous statues known only from literary sources are sometimes recognizable in paintings. In addition to the previously noted paintings of the Doryphorus and the like, another example may be seen in three reproductions of the Hermes of Olympia.<sup>7</sup> Two other, rather curious derivations are the examples of representations of *paideia* (learning) from the so-called Basilica at Herculaneum. Living couples of Achilles and Chiron (fig. 3) and Marsyas and Olympus are eternalized during music lessons; at the same moment the pairs are affectively embraced in a sort of pedagogic erotic gesture. Their background shows the marble incrustation of an opulent building, which is unnatural for these persons, who are more usually associated with nature. This background, therefore, betrays the very nature of the couples as sculptural groups, probably those that stood in the Saepta in Rome until that complex burnt down in 80 C.E.<sup>8</sup>

The last instance of this category of reproductions of famous statues pertains to the famous motif of the embracing three Graces, which was invented in the Hellenistic era. There are reflections in both three-dimensional and relief sculpture, mosaic, and painting. Here the question of which medium was first cannot be solved at all, and, with Bettina Bergmann, one may conclude: "Slipping between one context and another, one medium and another, different scales and audiences, today there is no original 'Three Graces,' only subtle examples of *aemulatio* that celebrate *techné*."<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup> One is painted in a niche in the House of the Ship (VI 10, 11, room 16); two are shown as satyrs in the House of the Gilded Cupids (VI 16, 7, room F), and Villa Imperiale, portico C; see Moormann, *La pittura*, 181, cat. 207.2; 186, cat. 220.1; 222, cat. 305.2.

<sup>8</sup> The Achilles and Chiron group is present as painted versions of three-dimensional white statues in the House of the Wounded Adonis and appears in relief on sarcophagi; see Moormann, *La pittura*, 170, cat. 198–9.

<sup>9</sup> Bettina Bergmann, "Greek Masterpieces and Roman Recreative Fictions," *HSCP* 97 (1995): 79–120, quotation from p. 98. Think also of the sexually aroused

In contrast to the *paideia* groups from Herculaneum are those representations in which a human figure has an unnatural color. For example, the depiction of the Aphrodite in the genre scene of Erotes working in a silver workshop in the House of the Vettius Brothers at Pompeii is whitish and clearly suggests that the statue is made of silver.<sup>10</sup> Sometimes these figures are green or red and imitate bronze statues. In garden paintings, they are white, both to contrast with the plants and to imitate the stone or marble of which they are made.

As to depictions of statues in the numerous figural scenes, instances occur in many genres but principally in landscapes and mythological scenes: people giving offerings to a god in a rural sanctuary, Helen grasping the brown wooden *palladium* (a guardian statue and symbol of the *salus publica*, the well-being of the people) on the Acropolis of Troy, the green bronze Athena in the scene of Theseus and the Minotaur from the Villa Imperiale at Pompeii, and so on.<sup>11</sup> It is almost immediately clear that the sculptural nature of such figures is emphasized by the same means we have identified above.

One of the most controversial aspects of my work on depictions of statuary in Roman painting was what was seen as the one-to-one comparison between painted and three-dimensional sculpture.<sup>12</sup>

satyr assaulting a maenad or a hermaphrodite, of which examples in sculpture, mosaic, and painting are known; see Chrystina Häuber, "Vier Fragmente der Gruppe Satyr und Hermaphrodit vom Typus 'Dresdener Symplegma' des Museo Nuovo Capitolino in Rom," in *Hellenistische Gruppen*, 157–80; Adrian Stähli, *Die Verweigerung der Lüste: Erotische Gruppen in der antiken Plastik* (Berlin: Reimer, 1999), 57–68, 332–3; Monika Verzár-Bass, "Il satiro del *symplegma* con ermafrodito a Trieste in margine al problema dell'Einansichtigkeit dei gruppi ellenistici," in *Studi di archeologia in onore di Gustavo Traversari* (ed. Manuela Fano Santi; 2 vols.; Rome: Bretschneider, 2004), 2:907–27.

<sup>10</sup> Moormann, *La pittura*, 185, cat. 217.9.

<sup>11</sup> Astrid Pfretschner, "Götterstatuen auf pompejanischen Wandgemälden: Eine ikonographische Untersuchung" (Ph.D. diss., Innsbruck, 1977); Astrid Larchner, "Gemalte Götterstatuen: Ein Beitrag zur Ikonographie der pompejanischen Wandmalerei," in *Echo: Beiträge zur Archäologie des mediterranen und alpinen Raumes: Johannes B. Trentini zum 80. Geburtstag* (ed. Brinna Otto and Friedrich Ehrl; Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck, 1990), 197–208. In the latter essay, Larchner notes that the source models are seldom known (p. 204).

<sup>12</sup> My doctoral dissertation was published as Moormann, *La pittura*. For reviews, see Roger J. Ling, review of Eric M. Moormann, *La pittura parietale romana come fonte di conoscenza per la scultura antica*, *Classical Review* 39 (1989): 419–20; Elizabeth Bartman, review of Moormann, *AJA* 94 (1990): 701–4; Thomas Fröhlich, review of

Therefore, in the following I will concentrate on two aspects of these "statues on the walls": first the degree of imitation and realism and second the presence and/or absence of typically Roman items.

### PAINTING AND WRITING

One of the themes addressed in this volume is the relationship between statuary (and in my case, painted reproductions or evocations of statues) and literature. Mural paintings seldom are the subject of literary descriptions in antiquity. Some paragraphs in the seventh book of Vitruvius's *De architectura* discuss the development of the forms used and include a strong criticism of the fashion of his own days, the 30s and 20s B.C.E. Furthermore this work describes technical matters about stucco composition and layers.<sup>13</sup> Other writers describe and evoke panel painting (*pinakes*), developed in the Greek world, and the figural wall paintings of the fifth-century B.C.E. Polygnotus and Mikon in the Lesche of the Cnidians at Delphi or the Stoa Poikile in the Athenian Agora. These evocations — for instance, by Pliny in the first century C.E. and Pausanias a century or so later — recall an idealized past when beautiful works of art were produced.<sup>14</sup> Pliny is most concerned with likeness, evident particularly in his anecdotes about Apelles's use of beautiful women as a model for his Artemis or the

Moormann, *Gnomon* 62 (1990): 447–54; Helga von Heintze, review of Moormann, *Gymnasium* 97 (1990): 79–80; Eleanor W. Leach, review of Moormann, *JRA* 3 (1990): 258–9; Christine Delplace, review of Moormann, *Latomus* 50 (1991): 743–4; Françoise Queyrel, review of Moormann, *RAr* (1991): 394–5; Jan Bāzant, review of Moormann, *Eirene* 28 (1993): 144–5. Some subsequent scholarship relied on my work, for example, Allroggen-Bedel "Hellenistische Gruppen"; Larchner "Gemalte Götterstatuen"; Stročka, "Neros Statuenraub," 35–45, pls. 4–10; and most recently Peter Stewart, *Statues in Roman Society: Representation and Response* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 215.

<sup>13</sup> *De architect.* 7.5.2–3. A good edition with archaeological commentary is that in the French Budé series; see Bernard Liou and Michel Zuingheda, *Vitruve: De l'architecture Livre VII* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1995), with a commentary by Marie-Thérèse Cam.

<sup>14</sup> On Polygnotus and his colleague Mikon, see especially Pausanias, *Descr.* 1.15–16 (Athens, Stoa Poikile), 10.25–31 (Delphi, Lesche of Cnidians 10.25–31). Compare to the sources in Adolphe Reinach, *Textes grecs et latins relatifs à l'histoire de la peinture ancienne: Recueil Milliet* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1921), 86–155, nos. 100–135.

birds who pecked at the wooden panel of Zeuxis's still life of fruit, mistaking art for life.<sup>15</sup> These stories appealed greatly to Roman aesthetic values. They are similar to those about "living" sculptures, of which some examples will be discussed below.

Nevertheless, there might be some form of correspondence between writers and painters, as was pointed out recently by Andreas Grüner for the first century B.C.E.<sup>16</sup> He makes clear that the formal language and contents of literature and paintings alike changed in the same way during that period. Painters and writers apparently made use of similar fashionable topics and give evidence of a transition from "baroque" to "classical" forms in the age of Emperor Augustus at the end of the century. As was mentioned briefly at the beginning of this article, painters of mural decorations were more bound to fashionable schemes than to likeness. They incorporated suggestions or imitations of precious objects freely, working from their memory and using the objects around them. The same could also be true for the authors of poetry.

To come back to painting, this implies that depicted sculptures belong to the realm that mural paintings were meant to evoke, that of *tryphē* (softness, delicacy), luxury, pomp, palatial atmosphere, and Dionysiac *otium* (leisure). The practice of imitating sculpture, therefore, principally highlights the down-to-earth nature of Dionysiac genre sculpture, so popular as decoration of gardens and peristyles and at hand in precious and cheap variations throughout the Hellenistic and Roman world.<sup>17</sup> The real world of living, working, and

<sup>15</sup> Reinach, *Textes grecs*, 188–219, nos. 199–256; for Zeuxis's birds picking raisins, see Reinach, *Textes grecs*, nos. 236–7; Pliny the Elder, *Nat.* 35.64; Seneca the Elder, *Contr.* 10.5.27; for Apelles's painting of a nude Aphrodite Anadyomene, mentioned in numerous sources, see Reinach, *Textes grecs*, 314–61, nos. 400–486; Pliny the Elder, *Nat.* 35.91, and epigrams in the *Anth. pal.* 16.178–80, 182. Compare Paolo Moreno, *Pittura greca: Da Polignoto ad Apelle* (Milan: Mondadori, 1988); idem, *Apelle: La battaglia di Alessandro* (Milan: Skira, 2000).

<sup>16</sup> Andreas Grüner, *Venus ordinis: Der Wandel von Malerei und Literatur im Zeitalter der römischen Bürgerkriege* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2004).

<sup>17</sup> This was true for statuary in the private sphere as well; see Stewart, *Statues*, 249–59. I do not fully agree with Bettina Bergmann when she comments on the artist of the Villa della Farnesina: "The illusionist of the Villa Farnesina... simulated in order to transfer statues from public into private"; see Bergmann, "Greek Masterpieces," 106. There is no link between sculpture in the public domain and that on private walls, unless she is referring to the evocation of Greek masterworks,



worshipping, hence, is limited — as we will see — to *lararia* (shrines to household deities), façade paintings, and (rare) depictions of working practice. One example may be found in the representations of the forum of Pompeii originally installed in the small atrium of the hotel of Julia Felix at Pompeii and now residing in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale at Naples (fig. 5). These are the only examples that represent equestrian statues from the public domain within the domestic sphere, and in this case it seems that a more or less one-to-one imitation was intended.<sup>18</sup>

Writers have another agenda to consider. Orators like Cicero (106–43 B.C.E.) and Quintilian (ca. 35–90 C.E.) make comparisons between rhetoric and sculpture when they discuss the *art* of speaking and instruct the reader on the *artistry* of genre or rhetoric. The comparisons they make are restricted to *opera nobilia* — that is, to real works of art by known artists, like the famous sculptors Polyclitus and Praxiteles. Rhetoric is a variation of art but may also be considered *opera nobilia*, albeit an oral variety.

#### PAINTING AND SCULPTURE

Peter Stewart recently published a fascinating study on the “statuesque” in Roman culture, addressing the following questions: which factors determine the sculptural character, why are statues ubiquitous, and what do they represent in Roman society?<sup>19</sup> Stewart not only takes into consideration real, three-dimensional statues but also looks at the depictions of statues on coins, on finger rings, and in wall paintings. In his opinion painted statues correspond with true statuary in the real world because they are as frequent and ubiquitous as those in public and private space. Some high-quality Second Style paintings, where the “realm of the gods” is tangible, include the images of realistically figured shrines whose cult statues could be venerated like real statues.<sup>20</sup>

exposed in public collection; but even then there is little correspondence between real and painted statuary in this complex. For painted statues in this villa, see Moormann, *La pittura*, 233–6.

<sup>18</sup> Moormann, *La pittura*, 160, cat. 179.1; Allroggen-Bedel, “Hellenistische Gruppen”; Stewart, *Statues*.

<sup>19</sup> Stewart, *Statues*.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., 215.

He supports his argument by showing an opulent painted façade from the mid-first-century B.C.E. villa at Boscoreale (just north of Pompeii), and indeed the Villa of the Mysteries at Pompeii and the so-called Villa of Poppaea at Oplontis (also in the vicinity of Pompeii) provide similar examples.<sup>21</sup> In the later stages of this style, ca. the 40s–30s B.C.E., this realism is not as clear; according to Stewart, the wall painting cut out of a house in the *Insula Orientalis* that shows a *tholos* (round structure) with a silver or bright marble Aphrodite makes less sense as a “real” statue to the worshipper.<sup>22</sup> This variant of the Second Style expresses a reduction of the materiality of statues in painting. However, mythological and garden landscapes of the Third and Fourth Styles show larger statues, which more or less function as participants in the scenes. Still during the Fourth Style larger figures are inserted into the architectural schemes and either form part of these structures or are positioned in a visible place on pedestals or consoles (Stewart does not mention the latter two groups). None of these figures is religious, which might be different for garden sculptures. Thanks to their larger format, the figures again belong to the ubiquitous “statuesque.”

I would argue instead that the statues within the painted architectures are as unrealistic as the architectural schemes and belong to the “picturesque” rather than Stewart’s “statuesque.” These figures, therefore, do not represent sculptural devices *stricto sensu* but belong to the painter’s world. The painter has his schemes ready, picks elements out of them, and concocts a new ensemble on the wall on which he is working. To the painter, statues are a compositional item only, not a primary subject. This is true for the depictions of architecture as well; these do not reflect any building in the real world but allude to a desire for shaping a fictional world, with columns, bases, architraves, niches, and porches, in which sculptural elements play their role. The garden paintings, on the other hand, reflect the common practice of domestic gardens — painters saw plants combined with statues in

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 217–9.

<sup>22</sup> Pompeii, House VI 17, 41, now at the Museo Nazionale in Naples, inv. 8594 (Stewart, *Statues*, 219). See also Moormann, *La pittura*, 203–4, cat. 263; Volker Michael Stroocka, “Pompeji VI 17, 41: Ein Haus mit Privatbibliothek,” *MDAI, römische Abteilung* 100 (1993): 321–51, esp. 328–34, pl. 72.1 (color). On the *tholos*, cf. Grüner, *Venus ordinis*, 142–3, n. 121.

every house and enlarged and enriched such a setting by depicting the same elements; fountain basins were also added to the aforementioned elements.<sup>23</sup>

#### HOW TRUE IS A (PAINTED) COPY TO THE "ORIGINAL"?

Before we discuss the relationship of painted statues to real ones, it is important to address the issue of Roman "copying" in three-dimensional statuary. The discussion about the relationship between (lost) Greek originals and Roman copies or adaptations of these famous statues has changed during recent years from the old method of *Kopienkritik* (i.e., the association of Roman period sculptures with earlier Greek and Hellenistic masterpieces on the basis of comparable aspects and literary evidence) into a debate about the question of whether such copies really existed and to what degree Roman classicizing statues could satisfy the demand of the originals.<sup>24</sup> Today there exists a high degree of skepticism regarding the reliability of Roman pieces for the reconstruction of lost Greek statuary. In general, it is now assumed that Roman sculptors normally did not produce one-to-one copies, despite the evidence for such a practice in the fragments of gypsum casts from Baiae on the Bay of Naples.<sup>25</sup> Fewer and fewer of the lost Greek masterpieces, positively identified and reconstructed on the basis of Roman statues by Adolf Furtwängler and his mainly German successors, are wholeheartedly accepted.<sup>26</sup> The trend now is to view

<sup>23</sup> On the genre of garden paintings, see Salvatore Settis, *Le pareti ingannevoli: La villa di Livia e la pittura di giardino* (Milan: Electa, 2002).

<sup>24</sup> See the essay by Miranda Marvin, "Roman Sculpture: Reproductions or Polykleitos: The Sequel," in *Sculpture and Its Reproductions* (ed. Anthony Hughes and Erich Ranft; London: Reaktion, 1997), 7–28. Also compare with Elaine Gazda, ed., *The Ancient Art of Emulation: Studies in Artistic Originality and Tradition from the Present to Classical Antiquity* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2002).

<sup>25</sup> Christa Landwehr, *Die antiken Gipsabgüsse aus Baiae: Griechische Bronzestatuen in Abgüssen römischer Zeit* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1985). A seminal study of Roman sculpture and copying is Paul Zanker, *Klassizistische Statuen: Studien zur Veränderung des Kunstgeschmacks in der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 1974).

<sup>26</sup> Adolf Furtwängler, *Meisterwerke der griechischen Plastik: Kunstgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1893). See further Elaine Gazda, "Beyond Copying: Artistic Originality and Tradition," in *The Ancient Art of Emulation*, 1–24.

Roman sculptures as genuine products of a classicizing taste, more or less reflecting Greek works of art. If Miranda Marvin is correct, "copying" was much less obvious than we have hitherto assumed, but this does not mean that we ought to disclaim all attributions or associations of Roman "copies" with Greek originals.<sup>27</sup>

When we turn to the reflections of ancient sculptures in media other than statuary itself, the question becomes still more problematic. Regarding the two-dimensional reproductions — if I may use this term — there are many problems concerning the translation from three- to two-dimensional images. These issues have been tackled for images of statues reproduced on Greek vases, Roman coins, and Roman gems, and these discussions pertain to wall painting as well.<sup>28</sup> Stewart argues: "The makers of lamp-decoration, coin-dies, and wall-paintings, and artists in all different media, were obliged more than writers to make (perhaps subconscious) decisions about the manner in which statuary were depicted."<sup>29</sup> All artists and artisans worked with stock figures and models, whether for whole figures or parts, or for attitudes and iconography according to the notion of *schēma* (form, shape, outward appearance) or *forma* (the Latin equivalent).<sup>30</sup> Painters probably felt less tied to examples from the "Great Arts," and the insertion of works of art like statues formed part of a general desire to evoke *copia* — i.e., a painter's wealth and abundance. Therefore, we may conclude that the statues in paintings were not necessarily one-to-one imitations, though this did not prevent painters from choosing determinate types.

A look at some examples may illustrate these observations. The Hermes of Olympia is reproduced three times, once independently, standing within a niche in the upper zone of the wall, and twice as a

<sup>27</sup> Marvin, "Roman Sculpture."

<sup>28</sup> Gertrud Platz-Horster, *Statuen auf Gemmen* (Bonn: Habelt, 1970); Karl Schefold, "Statuen auf Vasenbildern," *JdI* 52 (1937): 30–75; Hans Lohmann, *Grabmäler auf unteritalischen Vasen* (Archäologische Forschungen 7; Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1979); Léon Lacroix, *Les reproductions de statues sur les monnaies grecques: La statuaire archaïque et classique* (Liège: Faculté de philosophie et lettres, 1949); Andrew Burnett, "Buildings and Monuments on Roman Coins," in *Roman Coins and Public Life under the Empire: E. Togo Salmon Papers II* (ed. George M. Paul; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999), 137–64.

<sup>29</sup> Stewart, *Statues*, 221.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 231–49, with terminology on p. 237.

support of a thin column, balancing with one foot on an equally thin pillar.<sup>31</sup> This manner of depiction clearly does not correspond to the display of such an *opus nobile* in its original or even in its secondary context (as a "copy"). Were these insertions meant to be *capricci* (caprices)? In a way, the answer is yes. Statuary literally lost its gravity and lofty position when reproduced on the wall. This is certainly related to the fact that the painter was much freer than the sculptor, not being hindered by the statics (distribution of weights required for equilibrium) of the object. Moreover, the painted statues were deprived of the sacred function that they held in their original context in Olympia. Thus, these copies functioned as nothing more than decorative elements.

Another aspect that distinguishes the painter from the sculptor is that the former need not bother with the scale of his "reproduction." In practice, there are almost no life-size figures in Roman wall painting (except for the aforementioned category of *megalographiae* of the first century B.C.E.), and painted statues are no exception to this rule. In architectonic structures, statues are mostly tiny (cf. fig. 1) or vignettelike when we look at the figures standing on pedestals (fig. 2). They form one of the many composite elements of the overall painting and do not deserve any special status in that context. As to garden paintings (fig. 4), the dimensions correspond with those of the floral and faunal elements; i.e., they are full scale within the realm they populate. The small-scale painted statues correspond to those three-dimensional pieces displayed in the private realm, which are also mostly smaller than the statues exposed in public and religious contexts.<sup>32</sup> This small scale also underscores the lack of religious character in comparison with the original works.

Finally, wall painters who decorated houses did not have to cope with political messages when working in the private realm. The house reflected the status — and therefore the political importance — of the *patronus* (owner or head of the household), but its floor and wall decorations remained devoid of truly political elements.<sup>33</sup> One has only to

<sup>31</sup> Niche: House of the Ship, VI 10, 11, room 16; as satyrs: House of the Gilded Cupids, VI 16, 7, room F, and Villa Imperiale, portico C; see Moormann, *La pittura*, 181, cat. 207.2; 186, cat. 220.1; 222, cat. 305.2.

<sup>32</sup> See Elizabeth Bartman, *Ancient Sculptural Copies in Miniature* (Leiden: Brill, 1992).

<sup>33</sup> Timothy Peter Wiseman demonstrated that there are other means to express the political impact of the *patronus*; see "*Conspicui postes tectaque diga deo*: The Public

go through one of the modern manuals on Roman painting to observe the absence of truly Roman topics and mythological images and the domination of Dionysus and Venus in the figurative realm.<sup>34</sup> Even in the debates on the so-called *megalographia* of Boscoreale, frequently interpreted as a historical and/or political sequence of scenes, there still remain strong doubts about its supposed values and messages.<sup>35</sup>

#### PYGMALION'S DREAMS ON THE WALLS

One of the *capricci* that these painters could express was the degree of liveliness in their figures. Thus, we see "living" figures transformed into herms and supporting cornices, as in the cryptoporticus of the house named after that gallery at Pompeii and in the garden painting of the House of the Golden Bracelet (fig. 4). Painters upheld the great tradition of the famous Apelles, Zeuxis, and Nikias. According to Pliny and other authors, these artists were known for their *trompe l'oeil* — i.e., their skill in tricking the eye with the impression that painted fruit was in fact edible, that painted birds could fly away, and that the viewer could remove a curtain to see what was hidden behind. Unfortunately we do not have examples of this kind in the extant paintings, but mosaics showing the motif of the "unswept room," the so-called *asarotos oikos*, come close to this notion.<sup>36</sup>

Image of Aristocracy and Imperial Houses in the Late Republic and Early Empire," in *Lurbs: Espace urbain et histoire (I<sup>er</sup> siècle av. J.-C.–III<sup>e</sup> siècle ap. J.-C.)* (Collection de l'École française de Rome 98; Rome: École française de Rome, 1987), 393–413. See in general John R. Clarke, *The Houses in Roman Italy, 100 B.C.–250 A.D.: Ritual, Space and Decoration* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992); Eleanor W. Leach, *The Social Life of Painting in Ancient Rome and on the Bay of Naples* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

<sup>34</sup> Alix Barbet, *La peinture romaine* (Paris: Picard, 1985); Roger Ling, *Roman Painting* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Harald Mielsch, *Römische Wandmalerei* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2001).

<sup>35</sup> Frank G. J. M. Müller, *The Wall Paintings from the Oecus of the Villa of Publius Fannius Synistor in Boscoreale* (Amsterdam: Gieben, 1994), 23–35. Compare Mario Torelli, "The Frescoes of the Great Hall of the Villa at Boscoreale," in *Myth, History and Culture in Republican Rome: Studies in Honour of T. P. Wiseman* (ed. David C. Braund and Christopher J. Gill; Exeter: University of Exeter Press, 2003), 217–56.

<sup>36</sup> See the numerous testimonies collected in Reinach, *Textes grecs*. Still-life paintings in the first century B.C.E. and the correspondence with literary sources are discussed by Burkhardt Wesenberg, "Zum integrierten Stilleben in der Wanddekoration

Looking at the happy Dionysiac figures in the small room 4 of the Villa of the Mysteries at Pompeii, one immediately confronts the paradox of real sculpture versus painted statuary. Dionysus, accompanied by a satyr, a dancing satyr, and a Muse with a scroll, are standing on pedestals in front of a wall revetment of red slabs (fig. 2).<sup>37</sup> They announce the Dionysiac realm that dominates the hall next-door. Because of the pedestals, the figures must be read as statues, forming a small gallery of sculptures exposed in the tiny cubiculum next to the room with the "Mystery" paintings. However, at the same time these painted statues are as living as those moving figures, whereas the "Mysteries" people — as Burkhard Wesenberg once pointed out — in effect fail to live and instead look like the wax figures created by a modern artist such as Duane Hanson.<sup>38</sup>

Every onlooker has to make up his mind about what is real and what is not. This is true here but also in three-dimensional sculpture. The history of ancient sculpture as seen through the eyes of the ancient authors, probably evoking thoughts of their own kinsmen, abounds with examples that evoke the reaction of being startled by the veracity of sculptural depictions. The legendary artists Hephaestus and Daedalus were said to have formed figures out of clay and metal

des zweiten pompejanischen Stils," in *Functional and Spatial Analysis of Wall Painting* (ed. Eric M. Moormann; Leiden: Stichting BABESCH, 1993), 160–7. The bird anecdote is discussed in Renaud Robert, "Des oiseaux dans les architectures," in *Functional and Spatial Analysis*, 168–73. For the "unswept room," see Eric M. Moormann, "La bellezza dell'immondezza: Raffigurazioni di rifiuti nell'arte ellenistica e romana," in *Sordes urbis: La eliminación de residuos en la ciudad romana* (ed. Xavier Dupré Raventos and José Antón Remolà; Rome: Bretschneider, 2000), 75–94.

<sup>37</sup> Moormann, *La pittura*, 224–5, cat. 306.2 (with illustrations); Allroggen-Bedel, "Hellenistische Gruppen," 358, who sees the figures as a "Vexierspiel zwischen den Realitäten" (a play on realities).

<sup>38</sup> Burkhardt Wesenberg, "Zur Bildvorstellung im großen Fries der Mysterien-villa," *Kölner Jahrbuch für Vor- und Frühgeschichte* 24 (1991): 67–72. The bibliography concerning the "Mysteries" paintings is extremely vast; see Elaine K. Gazda, ed., *The Villa of the Mysteries at Pompeii: Ancient Ritual, Modern Muse* (Ann Arbor: Kelsey Museum of Archaeology and University of Michigan Museum of Art, 2000); Gilles Sauron, *La grande fresque de la villa des Mystères à Pompéi: Mémoires d'une dévote de Dionysos* (Paris: Picard, 1998). For Duane Hanson, see Laurence Pamer and Marco Livingstone, *Duane Hanson: A Survey of His Work* (Fort Lauderdale: Museum of Art, 1998); Thomas Buchsteiner and Otto Letze, *Duane Hanson: More than Reality* (Ostfildern-Ruit: Hatje Canz, 2001).

that were capable of life and came to life on their own or as *automata* (machines that could move; predecessors to robots).<sup>39</sup> In fact, there are ample literary examples of “living” statues or statues so realistic that they were thought to be alive.

The first example represents the portrait of a living person, who, in this form, will remain present among his admirers. The text about this statue is found in a recently published papyrus in Milan containing a series of epigrams attributed to Posidippus of Pella (ca. 310–240 B.C.E.). One section is dedicated to *andriantopoiika* and contains the description of the portrait of the Alexandrian librarian Philitas:

This bronze, similar to Philitas in all aspects, Hecataeus accurately moulded it down to the tip of the toes, following the human [measures] in height and body and without instilling anything from the image of heroes. In fact with all his skill he portrayed the old perfectionist by adhering to the canon of truth. He looks like one on the point of speaking, embellished with such character, [alive], although the old man is of bronze.<sup>40</sup>

Hecataeus probably worked in the style of the highly admired Lysippus, the former court artist of Alexander the Great, and rendered the old philosopher vividly. The bronze portrait must have matched the representation of intellectuals from the late classical period onwards.<sup>41</sup> The open mouth is on the point of speaking or at least breathing. The

<sup>39</sup> See Homer, *Il.* 18.373–379, 417–421; Marion Muller-Defeu, *La sculpture grecque: Sources littéraires et épigraphiques* (Paris: École nationale supérieure des beaux-arts, 2002), nos. 80–150; Johannes Overbeck, *Die antiken Schriftquellen zur Geschichte der bildenden Künste bei den Griechen* (Leipzig: W. Engelmann, 1868; repr., Hildesheim: Olms, 1959), nos. 74–142. On *automata*, see Henner von Hesberg, “Mechanische Kunstwerke und ihre Bedeutung für die höfische Kunst des frühen Hellenismus,” *Marburger Winckelmann-Programm* (1987): 47–72; Graham Zanker, *Modes of Viewing in Hellenistic Poetry and Art* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 2003), 116.

<sup>40</sup> Posidippus, *Epigr.* 63 (ed. and trans. Austin and Bastianini, 87). On *andriantopoiika*, see Zanker, *Modes of Viewing*, 141.

<sup>41</sup> See for that topic Paul Zanker, *Die Maske des Sokrates: Das Bild des Intellektuellen in der Antike* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1995); trans. as *The Mask of Socrates: The Image of the Intellectual in Antiquity* (trans. Alan Shapiro; Berkeley: California University Press, 1995); Ralf von den Hoff, *Philosophenporträts des Früh- und Hochhellenismus* (Munich: Bering & Brinkmann, 1994).



man is old, like all intellectuals portrayed in sculpture, and lacks the idealized physiognomy of heroes. In sum, the statue seems to be the living Philitas himself.<sup>42</sup>

The Romans were fond of stories about statues that they possessed, which were like inspired beings. A famous instance is the feature of the so-called frozen movement found in the statues of the Athenian sculptor Myron; he was capable of representing a figure in motion as if he or she were caught in a single film frame. The only examples of Myron's work that we know, albeit in Roman marble adaptations, are the *Diskobolus* (the Discus Thrower) and the Athena and Marsyas Group, of which various marble copies exist.<sup>43</sup> In the numerous testimonies about this mid-fifth-century B.C.E. sculptor, however, his heifer, displayed from the late first century C.E. onwards in the Temple of Peace at Rome (though now lost), was regarded as the absolute highlight of his skill.<sup>44</sup> There are numerous epigrams focused on this piece in the ninth book of the *Anthologia Palatina*.<sup>45</sup> In two of the epigrams a peasant thinks that he can use the animal for his farm work, but the beast turns out to be Myron's statue.<sup>46</sup> The heifer was remembered by Ovid, the first time in a Roman setting, around the beginning of the Common Era: "Like the heifer, a work of Myron, looking like a real one."<sup>47</sup> The unknown author of the first-century C.E. *Aetna* boasted that the Greek paintings and statues had "fixed eyes," while "the glory of Myron is now living."<sup>48</sup> Among Ausonius's late antique

<sup>42</sup> See the analysis by Elizabeth Kosmetatou, "Vision and Visibility: Art Historical Theory Paints a Portrait of New Leadership in Posidippus' *Andriantopoiitika*," in *Labored in Papyrus Leaves: Perspectives on an Epigram Collection Attributed to Posidippus* (CPMil.Vogl. VIII 309) (ed. Benjamin Acosta-Hughes, Elizabeth Kosmetatou, and Manuel Baumbach; Washington D.C.: Center for Hellenic Studies, 2004), 187–211, esp. 191–7; cf. also Kathryn Gutzwiller, "Posidippus on Statuary," in *Il papiro di Posidippo un anno dopo* (ed. Guido Bastianini and Angelo Casanova; Florence: Istituto Papirologico G. Vitelli, 2002), 41–60, esp. 46–47 (for a good characterization of its position within the *Andriantopoiitika*); Zanker, *Modes of Viewing*, 69.

<sup>43</sup> Most recently, see Carol Mattusch, "In Search of the Greek Bronze Original," in *The Ancient Art of Emulation*, 99–115, esp. 101–6, figs. 5.2–5.3.

<sup>44</sup> Procopius, *De bello Goth.* 4.21; Muller-Defeu, *La sculpture*, no. 725.

<sup>45</sup> Muller-Defeu, *La sculpture*, nos. 726–61; Overbeck, *Die antiken*, nos. 553–88.

<sup>46</sup> *Anth. pal.* 9.732, 742; Muller-Defeu, *La sculpture*, nos. 738–9; Overbeck, *Die antiken*, nos. 566 and 565.

<sup>47</sup> *Ep. ex Ponto* 4.1.34.

<sup>48</sup> *Aetna* vs. 592–3. Muller-Defeu, *La sculpture*, no. 763; Overbeck, *Die antiken*, no. 590 (here attributed to Lucilius Junior, a friend of Seneca).

epigrams, eleven pieces are dedicated to Myron's animal.<sup>49</sup> The following epitomizes several aspects:

Daedalus, why waist energy in a senseless art?  
Rather put me in the place of the enclosed Pasiphae.  
If you want to deceive a real cow, Daedalus,  
The cow of Myron will be for you the living example.<sup>50</sup>

To this we may add a recently discovered poem among the aforementioned epigrams of Posidippus. Dating to the early third century B.C.E., it is the oldest source that mentions this work of art:

[To the ox herd, lo,] the cow seemed worthy to pull the plough  
[.....] and very profitable.  
[But when he stretched] his hand, he unexpectedly saw a cunning trick,  
[that it was not a real cow], but Myron's own artefact.<sup>51</sup>

Propertius mentions four heifers by Myron that were exposed in the portico of the Temple of Apollo Actiacus on the Palatine in Rome:

And around the altar stood the herds of Myron,  
four artificial cows, living statues.<sup>52</sup>

Another example is the Zeus at Olympia by the famous sculptor Pheidias, which was believed to move his eyebrows like the Zeus of Homer.<sup>53</sup> The Elder Seneca even hinted at the problem of the invisibility of the gods for the artist: "The artist has not seen Jupiter, but he made him thundering. Neither Minerva stood before his eyes, and nevertheless he invented and made the gods with that art."<sup>54</sup>

<sup>49</sup> Ausonius, *Epigr.* 58–68.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid. 60; Muller-Defeu, *La sculpture*, no. 765; Overbeck, *Die antiken*, no. 591. Translation by author.

<sup>51</sup> Posidippus, *Epigr.* 66 (ed. and trans. Austin and Bastianini, 88–89); cf. Kosmetatou, "Vision and Visibility," 201–3 and Gutzwiller, "Posidippus on Statuary," 54. The oldest soundly dated testimony (70 B.C.E.) is Cicero, *Verr.* 4.60.135; see Muller-Defeu, *La sculpture*, 723 and Overbeck, *Die antiken*, 551.

<sup>52</sup> Propertius, *Elegiae* 2.31.7; Muller-Defeu, *La sculpture*, no. 766; Overbeck, *Die antiken*, no. 592.

<sup>53</sup> E.g., Muller-Defeu, *La sculpture*, nos. 873 (Strabo, *Geogr.* 8.353), 877 (Dio Chrysostomos, *Dei cogn.* 25.383), and 885 (Dio Chrysostomos, *Diffid.* 412, where the author tries to evoke a statue as lively as that of Pheidias); Overbeck, *Die antiken*, nos. 698, 705, and 712.

<sup>54</sup> Seneca the Elder, *Contr.* 10.34 (Muller-Defeu, *La sculpture*, no. 890; Overbeck, *Die antiken*, no. 718).

Finally, *agalmatophilia* (attraction to statues) sometimes led to strange behavior.<sup>55</sup> The most famous example of an erotic attraction to statues is the Aphrodite of Cnidus, whose beauty enticed a young man to make love with her. And let us not forget Pygmalion, who fell in love with his own just-produced maiden of clay. Another case of statue-love was the sculpture of a boy by Strongylion, found irresistible by Brutus, who made the statue his lover.<sup>56</sup>

#### PAINTERS AS IMITATORS

In his *Venus ordinis*, Grüner demonstrates that painters and poets alike were *mimētai* (imitators). At the same time the literary and painted works show a tendency towards escape from the realm of *negotium* (work, business, and politics) for the realm of *otium* (leisure). Reality, in that atmosphere, is less compulsory.<sup>57</sup> Unnatural forms and diversion dominate, especially in the late first century B.C.E.<sup>58</sup> A good example is found in the aforementioned herms in the House of the Cryptoporicus, which on the one hand seem to represent real, living people but also evoke statues, evident in their lower parts and their function as supporting pillars. The *ratio veritatis* (respect for realism) diminishes and *monstra* (monstrous/unreal or unrealistic things) come into vogue.

Vitruvius, the author of the treatise on architecture who wrote in the time of Augustus during the first century B.C.E., criticized these painted *monstra* precisely because their subjects did not exist in life and therefore could not exist in painting.<sup>59</sup> But an artist also had the task of *delectare* (to delight and divert), and the increasing complexity of the structures painted on the walls corresponds with that notion.<sup>60</sup> Therefore, even the house of Vitruvius's emperor Augustus was full of these unnatural forms. One might even argue that Vitruvius paved the

<sup>55</sup> Deborah T. Steiner, *Images in Mind: Statues in Archaic and Classical Greek Literature and Thought* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 185–250. For later periods, see Stewart, *Statues*, 264–7.

<sup>56</sup> Müller-Defeu, *La sculpture*, nos. 1089–91; Overbeck, *Die antiken*, nos. 880–3.

<sup>57</sup> Grüner, *Venus ordinis*, 108.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, 116–7.

<sup>59</sup> Vitruvius, *De architect.* 7.5.3; Grüner, *Venus ordinis*, 53.

<sup>60</sup> Grüner, *Venus ordinis*, 70.

way for the development of the classicizing Augustan style at the end of the first century B.C.E.<sup>61</sup>

Another clear case of this sort of painting that includes "dubious" architecture is found in the caryatids of the early Augustan paintings of the Villa della Farnesina at Rome and those in the late Augustan murals in the Villa Imperiale at Pompeii. These figures barely support an entablature, and, in that sense, they are "impossible" elements in their architectonic setting.<sup>62</sup> They lack the *pondus* (weight, mass) that their sculptural sisters in the Forum of Augustus display. As to the Farnesina examples, Grüner points at the erring eye of the viewer and the lack of statics. The walls form *capricci* in the way contemporary esoteric poetry does, and therefore we grasp their charm.<sup>63</sup> This lack of weight also characterizes the two depictions of the Hermes of Olympia in Third Style murals discussed above.

Striking examples of living statues can be observed in garden paintings, a genre that became fashionable in the early first century C.E. The splendid frescoes of a garden room from the House of the Golden Bracelet at Pompeii (fig. 4) show a garden against a Mediterranean azure sky. Birds and plants are rendered realistically and are recognizable.<sup>64</sup> The sculpture consists of fountain basins and herms supporting small reliefs. If one takes a closer look at the upper parts of these herms, one sees the realistic, jolly faces of satyrs, and one of the reliefs supported by their heads has the depiction of a sleeping maenad. The painter depicts the combination of a civilized, city garden with neatly planted shrubs, trees, and flowers and the "animalesque" Dionysiac figures that populate the real Arcadia, which is evoked simultaneously in this room. He transports us into a realm that we normally cannot grasp. The painting evokes the statues of the Barberini Faun and the Drunken old women once displayed in gardens of Hellenistic

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., 249.

<sup>62</sup> See the remarks in *ibid.*, 199, 203–4.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid., 224–5, 229.

<sup>64</sup> On the Casa del Bracciale d'Oro, see Centro mostre di Firenze, *Il giardino dipinto nella casa del bracciale d'oro a Pompei e il suo restauro* (Florence: Università Internazionale dell'Arte, 1991); *idem*, *Rediscovering Pompeii* (Rome: Bretschneider, 1990), cat. 163; Moormann, *La pittura*, no. 262 (herm with relief); Eric M. Moormann, "Giardini ed altre pitture nella casa del frutteto e nella casa del bracciale d'oro a Pompei," *Mededelingen van het Nederlands Instituut te Rome* 54 (1995): 214–28. See also Settis, *Le pareti*.

Alexandria — the real world juxtaposed with semidivine satyrs. Although humans are not able to see the latter in reality, they can now view them in these Roman wall paintings.<sup>65</sup>

#### ROMAN THEMES — PRESENT OR ABSENT

Whereas most painted sculpture belongs to the Greco-Hellenistic realm of Dionysus, Aphrodite, and some of the Olympian gods, and includes the idyllic and rustic figures of satyrs, maenads, Pan, and the fertility god Priapus, some rather “Roman” categories of sculpture known from three-dimensional examples are conspicuously absent:

- 1) historical scenes in (imitation of) commemorative relief or statuary,
- 2) portraits in the shape of three-dimensional busts or full statues,<sup>66</sup>
- 3) typically Roman gods (except for those in painted *lararia*).

The dearth of these categories is a simple matter of function and environment. The Roman topics embodied in these categories had an important public function. This sort of statuary was ubiquitous and reminded people of the representation and glory of the state and of public life. It is not only in murals of the private sphere where we observe the absence of these types of public statement; three-dimensional statues of this type are also absent from the domestic realm. This, again, corresponds with the private character of domestic decoration.

The only category of Roman themes that appears in Roman mural painting is the painting of statues in household shrines (*lararia*).<sup>67</sup>

<sup>65</sup> I owe this idea of voyeurism and looking upon sleeping figures to the fascinating essay by Christian Kunze, “Die Konstruktion einer realen Begegnung: Zur Statue des Barberinischen Fauns in München,” in *Neue Forschungen zur hellenistischen Plastik: Kolloquium zum 70. Geburtstag von Georg Daltrop* (ed. Gerhard Zimmer; Eichstätt/Ingolstadt: Katholische Universität Eichstätt-Ingolstadt, 2003), 9–47.

<sup>66</sup> Compare Stewart, *Statues*, 258–9. *Imagines clipeatae*, possibly reflecting portraits, are present in some Vesuvian residences, like the atria of the Villa of Oplontis and the Casa del Bell’Impluvio at Pompeii. Compare Moormann, *La pittura*, 77; for equestrian statues, see fig. 5.

<sup>67</sup> George K. Boyce, *Corpus of the Lararia at Pompeii* (Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome 14; Rome: American Academy in Rome, 1937); David Gerald Orr, “Roman Domestic Religion: A Study of the Roman Household Deities and Their Shrines at Pompeii and Herculaneum” (Ph.D. diss., University of Maryland,

Indeed, all detailed and cursory discussions of these painted representations recognize their strong resemblance to three-dimensional statuettes found in real *lararia*.<sup>68</sup> *Lararia* belonged to the private sphere and, in that sense, occupied the same realm as mural paintings. The repertoire of gods living in these household shrines was limited and especially dominated by Lares and Genii, who were represented in standard forms. Painted *lararia* did not differ from built-in or free-standing *aediculae* (small shrines) in which real bronze statuettes of the tutelary gods were displayed. Some of these small domestic shrines even had a double set of household gods, one in painted and the other in three-dimensional form. In the sphere of domestic religion, *lararia* of all forms served the same purpose. Therefore, painters creating a painted *lararium* followed the form and function of the three-dimensional examples. Apparently the parameters for this category of shrines were fixed.

#### A SINGLE EXAMPLE OF PAINTED STATUES FROM THE NEAR EAST

So far in this study, no painted statuary has been mentioned from the region that is central to the current book, the Roman Near East. Indeed, very few examples of paintings that include sculptural motifs have been preserved from this region, even in rich findspots like Ephesus, Zeugma (both in modern Turkey), and the Herodian palaces in Israel.<sup>69</sup> The paintings of Pompeii, however, may serve as

1972); Thomas Fröhlich, *Lararien- und Fassadenbilder in den Vesuvstädten* (Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 1991). See also Anna Kryszowska, *Les cultes privés à Pompéi* (Wrocław: University of Wrocław, 2002).

<sup>68</sup> For this reason they were not discussed in Moormann, *La pittura*, mentioned *passim* in the text; cf. index p. 285, s.v. "larario,"

<sup>69</sup> On paintings from Asia Minor in general, see Orhan Bingöl, *Malerei und Mosaik der Antike in der Türkei* (Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 1997). On paintings from Ephesus, see Volker Michael Strocka, *Die Wandmalereien der Hanghäuser in Ephesos* (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1977); Norbert Zimmermann, "Ausstattung von Haupt- und Nebenräumen: Zur Datierung der Wandmalereien des Hanghauses 2 in Ephesos," in *Das Hanghaus 2 von Ephesos* (ed. Fritz Krininger; Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2002), 101–17; Volker Michael Strocka, "Die Fresken von Hanghaus 2 — ein Vierteljahrhundert später," *Österreichische Jahreshefte* 71 (2002): 285–98; for painted statues in Ephesus, see Moormann, *La pittura*, 101–2. On paintings from Zeugma, see John

a representative sample for the *koinē* of the late Hellenistic and Roman periods, because in other respects paintings elsewhere match those from the cities buried by Vesuvius in 79 C.E. Thus, many of the remarks made above might be true for other areas as well.

For example, the genre of *lararium* paintings has a counterpart in late antique Dura-Europos, and Susan Downey has discussed the paintings from the Temple of Bel thoroughly in this volume. On one of these murals, soldiers from the XX Palmyrene Cohort are worshipping five gods: in the upper left corner, the three Palmyrene gods 'Aglibol, Iarhibol, and Baalshamin or Arsu,<sup>70</sup> and, below these figures, the personifications of Palmyra and Dura-Europos. The three military gods are depicted as statuettes, standing on round pedestals, while the two Tychae, or city-goddesses, beneath the threesome record a well-known sculptural type, that of the Tyche of Antioch by the Sicyonian sculptor Eutychides, who was active ca. 330–290 B.C.E (Downey, fig. 9).<sup>71</sup> The meticulous depiction of the pedestals on which these figures stand, with a concave profile, recalls bronze statuettes of divinities known from all over the ancient world, dedicated in sanctuaries and venerated in homes as well.<sup>72</sup> The painter wanted to render the scene in a realistic manner, according to the taste of Late Antiquity,

H. Humphrey, ed., *Zeugma: Interim Reports* (JRASup 51; Portsmouth, R.I.: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 2003), 79–99; Alix Barbet, *Zeugma II: Peintures murales romaines* (Varia Anatolica 17; Istanbul: Institut français d'études anatoliennes — Georges Dumézil, 2005). On paintings from Palestina, see Ehud Netzer, *Die Paläste der Hasmonäer und Herodes' des Großen* (Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 1999), fig. 13a–b (Jericho, Hasmonean palace, second century B.C.E.); fig. 27 (palace of Alexander Jannaeus near Jericho); figs. 48, 57, 64–65 (second and third palace of Herod at Jericho, last decades first century B.C.E.); figs. 104–6, 114–16, 122 (Masada, phases 1 and 2, last decades B.C.E.).

<sup>70</sup> They are also interpreted with different names, but this is not relevant to my argument. See Downey's article in this volume.

<sup>71</sup> Moormann, *La pittura*, 100–101, cat. 013.

<sup>72</sup> Many bronze statuettes from the Near East have been collected by Louis de Clercq, who bequeathed them to the Musée du Louvre at Paris. A great number of them have round bases with a concave profile like those of the painted figures; for some 45 examples, see volume 1 in André de Ridder, *Les bronzes* (Collection de Clercq 3; 2 vols.; Paris: E. Leroux, 1904–1905); cf. Marie-Odile Jentel, "Aphrodite (in periphéria orientali)," *LIMC* 2.1:154–66. In De Ridder's second volume from 1905 various other examples can be found (i.e., nos. 228, 286, 290, 296–7, 300–301, 313, 315, 323, 325). De Ridder does not describe the bases in a consistent manner, nor does he always depict them.

by showing the single elements in a clearly readable way. The models he knew were these standard figures. As for the scale, the painted statues of deities are smaller than their worshippers, which, if they were intended as representations of life-size statues, is not in any way realistic. Therefore, we might assume that the painted statues shown here are depictions of small statuettes similar to the real bronze images of gods so frequently found throughout the Roman world. It is thus reasonable to conclude that the soldiers worship at a shrine containing statuettes, although the architectural framework of the shrine is not illustrated in the wall painting in the Temple of Bel. This example, then, illustrates that though the evidence is scarce, the genre of painted statues must have occurred in cities and contexts throughout the Roman world, even in the Roman Near East. It also shows that some of the categories of painted statues found beyond Italy were analogous to those known from the more richly preserved Vesuvian cities.

#### CONCLUSION

The representations of statues in Roman wall painting were created throughout the Roman realm and differ from real sculptures in that the painters did not (have to) respect the constraints of sculptural arts like material, stance, and weight. Painters played with the medium as they pleased. Because a wider range of possibilities was available (e.g., use of color, freedom from statics, unrestricted display contexts), they could take advantage of this medium and thus expand the repertoire of realistic sculpture infinitely. Simultaneously, painters could explore the appeal of extreme realism — or verism — in the depiction of living figures as statues and statues as living figures. These qualities enhanced their art of painting. Statues on walls, therefore, more often participate in the world of the living, dwelling in the same rooms that these two-dimensional statues adorn, than that of the sculptor's fantasy or even of the imagination of writers evoking statuary.





Fig. 1 — Pompeii: Sarno Baths, room 7-7a, west wall, upper part, architectural structure with caryatids executed in stucco relief.



Fig. 2 Pompeii: Villa of the Mysteries, room 4,  
Muse with book scroll standing on a pedestal.



Fig. 3 — Herculaneum: The so-called Basilica, Chiron and Achilles.



Fig. 4 — Pompeii: House of the Golden Bracelet, garden room,  
herm supporting relief with maenad.



Fig. 5 — Pompeii: Hotel of Julia Felix, vestibule 24,  
The Forum of Pompeii.